



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1480  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,829	05/24/2001	Paul V. Werme	83019	2366

23501 7590 01/06/2006

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER, DAHLGREN DIVISION  
OFFICE OF COUNSEL, CODE XDC1  
17320 DAHLGREN ROAD  
DAHLGREN, VA 22448-5110

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2192

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/864,829

**Applicant(s)**

WERME ET AL.

**Examiner**

Eric B. Kiss

**Art Unit**

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The reply filed 22 September 2005 has been received and entered. Claims 2-37 are pending.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The replacement drawing sheets filed on 19 September 2001 are acceptable. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Applicant's amendments to the specification appropriately address the objection to the specification based in improper usage of trademarks. Accordingly, this objection is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 22 September 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner maintains that Brune discloses multiple specification files. As an example, Figure 4 on p. 282 illustrates a "first" specification file defining an SGI/Cray T3E that is included by reference in the illustrated "second" specification file illustrated in Figure 3 on p. 282 (see the seventh line of the code listing in Figure 3, "INCLUDE 'ZIB\_T3E'"). The Figure 3 specification file clearly provides application software system structure, capabilities, dependencies, and requirements (the file specifies three distributed SGI/Cray T3E sites connected by ATM channels with a nominal bandwidth of 10 Mbps).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12, 17, 19-22, 24, 25, 30, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Matthias Brune, et al., “A Resource Description Environment for Distributed Computing Systems,” IEEE, Proc. of 8th International Symposium on High Performance Distributed Computing HPDC-8, 1999, pp. 279-286 (hereinafter [Brune99]).

As per claim 2, [Brune99] discloses preparing first specification files in a language providing a syntax adapted to describe system and network specification information (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282); preparing second specification files in the language providing application software system structure, capabilities, dependencies, and requirements for the M managed characteristic applications (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282); compiling the first and second specification files to thereby generate specification objects (see, for example, section 4.3 on p. 282); and providing an application programming interface (API) permitting the functional elements to access the specification information using API calls (see, for example, section 6.1 on pp. 283-284).

As per claim 20, [Brune99] discloses preparing first specification files in a language providing a syntax adapted to describe system and network specification information (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282); preparing second specification files in the language

Art Unit: 2192

providing application software system structure, capabilities, dependencies, and requirements for the M managed characteristic applications (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282); compiling the first and second specification files to thereby generate specification objects organized into a system specification library (see, for example, section 4.3 on p. 282); and linking the program control function and the resource manager function to the system specification library (see, for example, section 6 on pp. 283-285).

As per claims 3 and 21, [Brune99] further discloses the second specification files describing the application software system structure in terms of systems, subsystems, paths, applications and processes (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 4 and 22, [Brune99] further discloses the second specification files further providing Quality of Service (QoS) requirements on an event basis (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 6 and 24, [Brune99] further discloses the second specification files further providing data flow path requirements in terms of both structure and Quality of Service (QoS) requirements for the M managed characteristic applications (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 7 and 25, [Brune99] further discloses one of the M managed characteristic applications comprising a scalable application (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 12 and 30, [Brune99] further discloses the second specification files providing environmental variables associated with the M managed characteristic applications (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 17 and 35, [Brune99] further discloses the second specification files providing application states defined in terms of received instrumentation data values, the length of time a respective application has been running, and/or the set of processes that are currently running (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

As per claims 19 and 37, [Brune99] further discloses one of the M managed characteristic applications comprising a scalable application (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282); and one of the second specification files identifying the type of scalability practiced by the scalable application (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5, 8, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [Brune99], as applied above to claims 2 and 20, and further in view of Brendan Jennings, et al., "FIPA-compliant agents for real-time control of Intelligent Network traffic," 1999, Elsevier Science B.V., Computer Networks 31, pp. 2017-2036 (hereinafter [Jennings99]).

As per claims 5, 8, 23 and 26, although [Brune99] fails to expressly disclose the second specification files further providing survivability requirements for the M managed characteristic applications or one of the M managed characteristic applications comprising a fault tolerant

Art Unit: 2192

application, where the degree of fault tolerance is selectable by a user, [Jennings99] teaches survivability requirements, in terms of an explicitly specified fault tolerance in the form of specification language (ACL) extensions (see, for example, section 5.3.2.1 on p. 2033).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of [Brune99] to include such survivability/fault-tolerance specifications as per the teachings of [Jennings99]. One would be motivated to do so to provide a fundamental property of real-time systems.

9. Claims 9 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [Brune99], as applied above to claims 2 and 20, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,005 to Lesaint et al.

As per claims 9 and 27, [Brune99] discloses such methods but fails to expressly disclose one of the M managed characteristic applications comprising a selectable priority application. However, *Lesaint et al.* teaches such selectable priority in the context of a resource allocator (see, for example, col. 12, line 52, through col. 13, line 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of [Brune99] to include such selectable priority as per the teachings of *Lesaint et al.* One would be motivated to do so, for example, to ensure that safety-critical tasks are handled in an expedited manner.

10. Claims 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 28, 29, 33, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [Brune99], as applied above to claims 2 and 20, and further in view of

Karl Czajkowski, et al., "A Resource Management Architecture for Metacomputing Systems," Proc. of 4<sup>th</sup> IPPS/SPDP Workshop on Job Scheduling Strategies for Parallel Processing, 1998, 19 pages (hereinafter [Czajkowski98]).

As per claims 10, 11, 15, 16, 28, 29, 33, and 34, although [Brune99] fails to expressly disclose identifying script files/signals associated with shut down of a managed characteristic application or the specification files providing startup and shutdown dependencies, [Czajkowski98] teaches such startup/shutdown handling (see, for example, section 5 on pp. 10-13), and thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of [Brune99] to include such handling. One would be motivated to do so, for example, to provide for accurate updates of resource status and availability for efficient scheduling.

As per claims 18 and 36, [Brune99] further discloses one of the M managed characteristic applications comprising a scalable application (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 281-282). [Brune99] fails to expressly disclose one of the second specification files identifying whether the scalable application can be restarted upon failure and the minimum and maximum number of copies of the scalable application that can be instantiated in the distributed environment. However, [Czajkowski98] teaches specifying copy counts for scalable applications (see, for example, section 4 on pp. 8-10) and further suggests specifying restart conditions in the event of failures (see, for example, the last paragraph of section 7 on p. 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of [Brune99] to include such count information and failure handling as per

the teachings of [Czajkowski98]. One would be motivated to do so, for example, to promote efficient resource allocation and provide compensation for scheduling failures.

11. Claims 13, 14, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [Brune99], as applied above to claims 2 and 20.

As per claims 13, 14, 31, and 32, [Brune99] teaches as an alternate embodiment (related work) providing command line arguments (requiring resolution at application runtime) associated with the M managed characteristic applications (see, for example, section 2 on pp. 279-280). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the methods of [Brune99] to include such related techniques, for example, as a means to efficiently handle dynamic information.

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2192

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Eric B. Kiss whose telephone number is (571) 272-3699. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tue. - Fri., 7:00 am - 4:30 pm. The Examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

EBK / ~~EBK~~  
January 4, 2006

  
TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER